IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO.132 OF 2001

Mr.R.V.More for the Petitioner.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's order or directions	Court's or Judge's orders
	CORAM: D.K.DESHMUKH, J.
	DATED: 13TH APRIL,2005

P.C.:

1. Revision Application of the petitioner has been rejected by the MRT as there was delay of 155 days in filing the Revision Application, which was not properly explained. The learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner is not able to point out to me from the record as what was the reason for delay and how that reason was substantially proved.

2. In this view of the matter, therefore, petition cannot be entertained.

3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that on the date on which the application was decided by the MRT, the Petitioner and his lawyer were absent, therefore, the application for review should not have been dismissed on the ground of delay. In my opinion, the submission is not well founded. Revisional Authority can decide the matter even in the absence of the parties on merits. Petition has no substance. It is rejected.

...